

REMARKS

Applicant submits the above-mentioned amendments to place the application in better condition for allowance. No new matter is added.

Applicant submits amended Claims 11 and 12 to overcome the Examiner's restriction requirement.

In a telephone discussion with the Examiner on March 8, 2001, the Examiner suggested the amendments as in the attached claims. In the discussion the Examiner stated that Claim 12 should be amended to be consistent with the scope of Claim 11. To this end, consistent with the examiners suggestion Applicant amends Claim 11 and 12.

Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in better condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

TRAVERSE

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's requirement of election for the reasons that follow.


Applicant amends Claim 11 to clarify that what is claimed is a method of operating a printing unit having a doctor blade chamber. In the language of present Claim 11 Applicant claims a method of operating a doctor blade chamber device in a printing unit. Since the language in Claim 12 states a printing unit in an offset machine having a means, the means is the doctor blade chamber device. Amended Claim 11 now contains the same preamble language of Claim 12. Therefore amended Claim 11 has overcome the restriction requirement. Notice to that effect is requested.

Applicant amends Claim 12 so that amended Claim 12 is in independent form. Present Claim 12 has the language "for use by a method according to claim 11". Claim 11 is directed to a method and Claim 12 is directed to an apparatus. Amended Claims 11 and 12 now contain the same preamble and are directed to the same invention having a method and apparatus. Therefore amended Claim 12 has overcome the restriction requirement. Notice to that effect is requested.

Under MPEP §803, in pertinent part, the Examiner must examine the entire application on the merits if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. It is submitted that all claims 11-20 are sufficiently related that a complete search for the subject matter of any

one group of claims would necessarily encompass a search for the subject matter of the remaining claims. In deed, it would appear that the subject matter of all the claims would be classified the same. Therefore, the restriction requirement has been overcome and withdrawal of the restriction is submitted. Notice to this effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



March 21, 2001
Date

Attorney for Applicants
Richard J. Streit
c/o Ladas & Parry
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 25765